



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/314,058	05/18/1999	MICHAEL V. LEMAN	MICE-0026-US	4641

7590 11/20/2002

COE F MILES
TROP PRUNER HU & MILES PC
8554 KATY FREEWAY
STE 100
HOUSTON, TX 77024

EXAMINER

EISEN, ALEXANDER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2674

DATE MAILED: 11/20/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/314,058

Applicant(s)

LEMAN, MICHAEL V.

Examiner

Alexander Eisen

Art Unit

2674

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 August 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 28-33 and 35-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 28-33 and 35-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 26, 27 and 34 have been cancelled and claims 28, 32, 35, 37 and 39 amended.

This amendment has been entered.

2. Claims 28-33 and 35-40 are pending in current application, claims 28 and 35 are independent claims.

3. The rejection of claims 32-33 under 35 U.S.C. 112(1) by the previous Office action are withdrawn as necessitated by the applicant's amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 28-33 and 35-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Batio, US 5,949,643 in view of Japanese Patent Publication 07-160363, hereinafter "Publication").

Batio discloses a portable computer having a split keyboard and pivotal screen halves, wherein a computer 100 is provided having a first display, a second display (screen halves 101 in FIG. 1, or main display 215 and side displays 204 in FIG. 19 embodiments), and a unit containing a keyboard 102, the unit is separate (detachable) from the displays (as could be seen from FIG. 19, for example, the first and second displays face in substantially same direction (say

Art Unit: 2674

first direction), the computer receives the input from the keyboard and capable of receiving a pen input (see FIG. 25 and column 10, lines 14-22). See also column 5, line 20-61 describing the keyboard input capabilities.

Batio does not teach explicitly that the embodiment described in conjunction with the FIG. 19 has a display hingedly attached to the base unit.

Publication teaches the embodiment (see FIGS. 7a and b), wherein a similar to Batio's three-display arrangement 43 has a pivotal connection to a base unit 41, so that three display sections can be folded together and down onto a keyboard unit thus improving the portability of the computer system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a pivotal connection between the display and the base unit in Batio's computer system in the embodiment described in FIG. 19 for ability to minimize a computer system and improve its portability.

As to claims 29 and 37, display halves are hingedly connected (hinges 216 in FIGS. 19 and 20; col. 9, lines 45-54).

As to claims 30, 31 and 38, the displays are capable of being rotated 360 degrees (Batio, column 9, lines 2-3) and as such can be foldable onto each other and onto keyboard in away that one of the working surface of the displays remain exposed.

As to claims 32 and 33 Batio teaches that in addition to pen input ability three independent program could be run simultaneously on the computer system, each employing a single screen and therefore it would be obvious to those skilled in the art that it is possible to

Art Unit: 2674

display an image on one of the screens while receiving a pen input on the other one of the screens.

As to claim 36, the unit 102 is providing a base unit for a laptop computer (see col. 2, lines 52-56; col. 8, lines 14 – 56).

As to claims 39 and 40, the computer is adapted to work with both keyboard and pen input.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alexander Eisen whose telephone number is **(703) 306-2988**. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:00 a.m - 4:00 p.m.).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard A. Hjerpe can be reached on **(703) 305-4709**.

Any response to this action should be **mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or **faxed to:**

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only).

Hand-delivered responses should be **brought to:** Crystal Park Two, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, Virginia, Sixth Floor Receptionist.

Art Unit: 2674

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be **directed to:** Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office, whose telephone number is **(703) 306-0377**.



Alexander Eisen
November 13, 20022



RICHARD HJERPE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600